

# SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

13th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XIII, Number 10

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

June 1, 1983

## Tales From the Pork Barrel Route to R&D Money

For universities seeking federal research support, the officially prescribed route entails formal application to the relevant agencies and departments, systematic review by inhouse and often, too, outside specialists, and, finally, if all is in order and funds are available, a grant or a contract. It is rare for the process to be completed in less than a year; two to three are not uncommon if the quest is for millions for a major facility. And many worthy applicants get nothing.

There is another route, however, one that leapfrogs the aforementioned barriers. It is the Congressional route—direct, swift, and sure, but open only to those who possess or can enlist political influence.

This is the story of how two universities, Catholic, in Washington, DC, and Columbia, in New York City,

### **Reagan Honors 12 With Science Medal—Page 7**

last month quietly mustered a great deal of such influence. And with it, they were able to whiz through the House of Representatives two previously unknown amendments tailored to provide them with new laboratories out of the treasury of the Department of Energy.

The cast of characters includes the Archbishop of Boston, Cardinal Humberto Medeiros, whose counsel is welcomed by House Speaker Tip O'Neill; several other bishops, influential members of the House, and a well-connected Washington consulting firm.

For Catholic University, the objective of this assemblage is a materials research center, to be known as the Vitreous State Laboratory, priced at \$13.9 million; for Columbia, a laboratory bearing the title of the National Chemical Research Center, for which the construction cost is set at \$20 million. In each case, the House authorized \$5 million for startup money in fiscal 1984, which begins next October. Neither project is yet homefree, but the odds look very good for both to make it through the full authorization and appropriations process. One reason is that the thrift-minded Congress can be assured that the two winning late starters will not add to the budget: the \$10 million is to be snipped from other research programs in the Department, including the pride of Presidential Science Adviser George A. Keyworth II, the newly proposed National Center For Advanced Materials Research, which is intended to rejuvenate the declining Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, in California.

As for what the Columbia and Catholic laboratories are intended to do and how they suddenly sprouted on the floor of the House, one must go elsewhere than the Department of Energy for information. For at the DoE, the response of officials who are normally well up on the Department's supplicants, programs, and financial commitments is that they had never heard of either laboratory until the Department's Congressional liaison people excitedly informed them that both had been authorized on the floor of the House in a matter of minutes. How did it happen?

The answer is that both universities, working independently of each other, decided to accelerate their quest for federal research funds by engaging the services of a politically well-connected, Washington-based consulting firm, Schlossberg-Cassidy & Associates, named after partners who are alumni of senior staff service on  
(Continued on page 3)

## In Brief

US spending on military R&D has increased by 82 percent since 1981, according to an analysis by the Science Policy Research Division of the Library of Congress. The figures, in current dollars, show that non-defense R&D has remained unchanged for the past three years. The contrast between the two sectors is increasingly striking: For the coming fiscal year, national security R&D is budgeted for about \$32 billion; civilian R&D remains at about \$14 billion.

In a guest editorial in *Science* of May 27, Edward E. David Jr., Nixon's White House science adviser and now President of Exxon Research and Engineering, suggests a "Troglodyte Frieze"—modeled after MIT's frieze honoring the greats of science—for those who have "retarded science." "Identification of villains on a personal level is not constructive," David says, but there is a curious item on his anonymous list: "The abortive initiative to mastermind automotive technology in the late 1970's [which] sprang from an opportunistic proposal to 'reinvent the automobile.' People making such appeals," warns David, "ought to recognize that with the inevitable disillusionment may come a nomination for the troglodyte frieze." The mastermind of the automotive research effort—the Cooperative Automotive Research Program—was Jimmy Carter's Science Adviser, Frank Press, now President of the National Academy of Sciences.

## Berkeley Materials Lab Draws Heavy Criticism

Administration research officials are snorting at the vagueness of the proposals for the Department of Energy to finance the construction of a \$20-million chemistry lab at Columbia University and a \$13.9-million materials lab at Catholic University.

But the plan for Administration's own favorite for new construction, the \$250-million National Center for Advanced Materials, at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, is so lacking in detail that DoE has been embarrassed into setting up a panel to fill in the details and pacify the oldline materials-research community.

The Berkeley lab, strongly pushed by Presidential Science Adviser George A. Keyworth as a tonic for an aging research center and a model for academic-industrial collaboration, first went public when the 1984 budget was released in February.

### *The Anderson Letter*

Offense at the absence of prior consultation was expressed by many, but perhaps most influential among them was the multi-titled Philip W. Anderson, a Nobel laureate Professor of Physics at Princeton, a Director of Bell Labs, a former Councilor of the National Academy of Sciences, adviser to DoE, and so on.

In a letter last February to Rep. Don Fuqua (D-Fla.), Chairman of the House Science and Technology Committee, Anderson deplored the absence of "careful examination in the community" before the lab was included in the budget. And he hit especially hard at the dearth of details concerning what was to be built with that huge sum.

Referring to a "vague" briefing by Lawrence Director David Shirley, Anderson wrote that it lacked "detailed budgets, precise organizational information, or any specification of formal connections with the University [of California, Berkeley] campus or formal arrangements for outside users for the large facility. Even the quantitative data on that facility were not of a nature that could be examined critically."

He added, "To my knowledge, this is the first case of funding at this level in the history of American science where consensus has not preceded a budget request...There are strong feelings [among materials scientists] that the University of California has not been required to provide the kind of support which it would normally give in exchange for such a unique facility. The manner in which this project reached the DoE budget has produced reactions of shock or of cynical acceptance."

Keyworth, though publicly conveying an attitude of cocky self-assurance, realizes that he cannot absorb too many broadsides of that kind from the heavyweights of the scientific community. So, he's got DoE to undertake a damage-control exercise, through a panel that was established in March by Alvin W. Trivelpiece, Director of DoE's Office of Energy Research.

The panel, chaired by Albert Narath, Executive Vice President of the Sandia National Laboratory, has been carefully charged to review the plans for the Berkeley lab, but not to do anything that might upset the venture.

### *Limits on the Review*

"I wish to make clear at the outset," Trivelpiece wrote to Narath, "that a revisitation of the Department's basic decision to establish this Center, with its associated facilities, is not being requested. ...Instead, the Panel's purpose is to critique and improve the initial...planning so that the best possible features and activities for this facility are incorporated during this early phase while it is still possible to make changes and improvements without incurring additional costs."

Thus, the panel is excluded from examining the fundamental question of whether it's wise to sink \$250 million into one grand materials-research laboratory. Trivelpiece asked it to report by the end of August.

©Science & Government Report, Inc., 1983

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher  
**Daniel S. Greenberg**

Associate Publisher  
**Wanda J. Reif**

Circulation Manager  
**Margaret E. Lee**

Contributing Correspondents

**Christopher Joyce, Kim A. McDonald (Washington); Francois Segquier (Paris); Ros Herman (London)**

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.*, twice monthly, except in January, July & August. Annual subscription: Institutions, \$132.50 (two years, \$235.00). Information about bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six months of publication date.

## ...Schools Told, They Can Make Buildings Appear

(Continued from page 1)

Capitol Hill. As one official of the DoE remarked of the firm, "They have gone to a large number of universities and told them they can make buildings appear."

The need for a building for Catholic's research on vitreous materials—for nuclear-waste disposal, fiber optics and other purposes—was stated to the University's President, William J. Byron, SJ, shortly after he took the post last fall. "I told him," said Theodore Litovitz, Director of the research program, "that we were spread all over the campus, even in hallways, and that we either had to get a building or cut back." Founded in 1968 with money from the Pentagon's spread-the-wealth program known as Project Themis, the Vitreous lab has a good reputation with industry, employs 14 faculty members and senior scientists, plus about 35 technicians and graduate students, but Catholic University has never made it to the big time in federal research support. The latest figures rank it as 189th in federal support of academic R&D, with a mere \$1.9 million.

Byron was sympathetic to the building plea, according to Litovitz, but became even more so when he learned that despite a general shortage of federal funds for laboratory construction, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory was in the DoE 1984 budget for \$20.9 million for construction that would eventually run to around \$250 million. But that project had its own problems, since Keyworth had stuck it into the DoE budget without consulting the mandarins of the materials sciences, and they were expressing resentment to their Congressional friends, as well as fears that their budgets might eventually be trimmed to fatten Keyworth's pet venture. For a shrewd political operators, this problem provided an opportunity.

### *We "Hastened The Quest"*

As Gerald S.J. Cassidy, of Schlossberg & Cassidy, explained to SGR, "Catholic University had talked to DoE in the past, but didn't know they had building funds. Then we heard about the LBL [Lawrence Berkeley Lab], and that hastened the quest."

President Byron, he said, made good use of the fact that 15 bishops from around the country serve on Catholic University's Board of Trustees. He also brought the matter to the attention of Congresswoman Lindy Boggs (D-La.), whom he met while serving from 1973-1975 as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Loyola University, in New Orleans. Mrs. Boggs serves on the Appropriations Subcommittee for the DoE.

Meanwhile, House Majority Leader Jim Wright (D-Texas) received a call from a Texas bishop. And

Rep. F. James Sensenbrenner Jr., of suburban Milwaukee, the ranking Republican on the House Science and Technology Subcommittee on Energy Development and Applications—which normally would have included the Catholic and Columbia proposals in its annual hearings—got a call from the Bishop of Milwaukee. Rep. Don Fuqua (D-fla.) who chairs the full Committee and the Subcommittee, may have felt offended by the end-run tactics, but a call from Speaker O'Neill brought him around.

### *Majority Leader's Meeting*

On May 12, the lab was discussed at a meeting in Wright's office attended by the President of Catholic University, Reps. Boggs and Sensenbrenner, and consultant Cassidy, who had thoughtfully prepared what all along had been lacking: a proposal for the Vitreous State Laboratory, as well as one for what was moving along without theological assistance, the National Chemical Research Center at Columbia.

That venture, according to Greg Fusco, Columbia's Vice President for Government Relations, had been in the works "for about a year." Asked by SGR whether a proposal had been submitted to DoE, he replied, "We approached our New York State [Congressional] delegation," in the course of which Columbia enlisted its very own Congressman, the influential Charles B. Rangel, a senior Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee.

The key scientific figure in the Columbia project, Professor Nicholas J. Turro, told SGR, "We had been planning the building for a long time, but didn't know how to get the money. Then the [university] administration told me to talk to Schlossberg & Cassidy."

Turro said that when he was in Washington at the end of April for the annual meeting of the National Academy of Sciences, "Cassidy took me around to meet a bunch of Congressional aides."

In contrast to the traditional proposal genre, both the Catholic and Columbia proposals were mainly descriptions of ongoing activities rather than a prospectus of what would be done if money were forthcoming. As one DoE official told SGR, "From the proposals, it's hard to say what these labs are planning to do."

On the afternoon of May 12, following the meeting in the Majority Leader's office, Rep. Norman Y. Mineta (D-Calif.) rose to introduce an amendment to the DoE authorization bill, which was the business before the House. Mineta, whose Santa Clara district is close to the Lawrence Berkeley Lab, proposed that \$5 million be "redirected" from the Berkeley Center for Advanced Materials "for the initiation of construction of the

(Continued on page 4)

## ...Absence of Proposal Protested on House Floor

(Continued from page 3)

Vitreous State Laboratory at the Catholic University of America."

This uncharacteristic bit of Congressional generosity for an institution on the other side of the continent seems a bit odd at first look, but the highhanded manner in which the Berkeley lab had been stuck into the DoE budget had generated some worrisome opposition to the project. The House Science and Technology Committee, responding to complaints of peeved materials scientists, had stated in its report that the "Administration apparently has bypassed the preferred review process, which typically involves representatives of the research community." With that comment, the Committee—prior to the arrival of the Vitreous Lab proposal—had reduced the authorization by \$5 million, but only after it had been assured that the five-year construction project could easily absorb such a reduction at the outset. Nonetheless, the Berkeley backers could see clouds on the horizon, and Mineta's proposal to cut Berkeley in behalf of the Catholic University project provided some additional insurance for their vast undertaking.

### Church and Vitreous State

Following Mineta's floor statement, which was drawn mainly from the "proposal" that Schlossberg & Cassidy had slapped together for the Vitreous Lab, Majority Leader Jim Wright stated that the project "is thoroughly worthwhile, and is the kind of thing nobody disagrees with." To which he added that the amendment "does not increase the total cost of the bill."

Unimpeded passage then seemed a certainty, but Sensenbrenner churlishly declined to participate in this curious episode of church and vitreous state. Having assigned his staff to nose around after the meeting that was held in the Majority Leader's office, Sensenbrenner noted that introduction on the floor mocked the process of authorization by committee—which is true, but certainly no rarity in Congressional pork-barreling. But then he homed in on the striking skimpiness of the proposal for a \$5-million downpayment on a \$13.9 million building:

"First. Catholic University has not submitted a written proposal detailing the time schedule, the size of the proposed facility, or justification for a new facility.

"Second. There are no architectural design or construction plans in existence for the facility.

"Third. The university is unsure of its location on the campus.

"Fourth. The facility will not be a user facility, that is, it will not be designed so that outside scientists will be encouraged and invited to use the facility, but instead

will be for the benefit of those scientists attached to the laboratory." [This point derives from Washington's stated preference for making expensive facilities widely accessible to the scientific community].

Sensenbrenner continued: "This project can no longer hide behind the veil of scientific research, but must instead be seen for what it really is, Political Pork."

Whereupon up popped Rep. Robert S. Walker (R-Pa.) to join his Wisconsin colleague in a battering colloquy:

"If I understand the gentleman correctly," said Walker, "...we are saying that all of the things that the authorizing committee went through and decided were meritorious, we are now going to decide on this floor that something that no one ever heard of before yesterday is going to come out here and take away money from the projects that we regarded as the most vital for the national interest. Is that what is happening?"

### Hail Columbia

Sensenbrenner: "The gentleman from Pennsylvania is absolutely correct. The universities in California that submitted their plans, that went through the committee authorizing process, won their vote in the committee and submitted all the voluminous documentation to do that, they are the losers...That means the siting of these buildings is decided on political considerations, rather than on scientific considerations..."

Rep. Boggs responded with a long statement about the Vitreous State Laboratory's importance for responding to the economic threat of foreign competition. And then she observed—oddly enough in regard to a university in the capital city—that if Catholic University "had been aware that the [federal] administration had proposed an enormous new initiative for materials research, and if it had been consulted in the preparation of that initiative, it certainly would have participated actively in the hearings process."

Speaker O'Neill called for a vote. The amendment "redirecting" \$5 million from the Lawrence Berkeley Advanced Materials Center to the Catholic University Vitreous State Laboratory passed, 261-113.

Forty minutes later, following consideration of several other items in the DoE authorization bill, Rep. Rangel came to bat for Columbia, offering an amendment that would take a total of \$5 million from several separate programs and switch the sum to the first stage of the National Center for Chemical Research.

Rangel assured the members that Chairman Fuqua and other members of the House Science and Technology Committee did not object to the redirect-

(Continued on page 5)



## In Quotes: Wirszup, Evangelist of School Reform

*If any one person can be credited with setting off the current national concern about science and math education, it is Izaak Wirszup, Professor of Mathematics at the University of Chicago, who, over the past three years, has passionately sermonized public and private audiences throughout the country. An influential consultant to the National Science Foundation, and popular witness at Congressional hearings, Wirszup was back on Capitol Hill May 24 to testify before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for HUD-Independent Agencies. With the country, from the White House down, now aroused about educational inadequacies, Wirszup has turned his attention to the issue of durable reforms. Following are excerpts from his testimony:*

Until recently, my reports on the Soviet educational mobilization and its tremendous investments in technical manpower training programs often met with objections. A frequent reaction was that Soviet educational achievements should not be taken seriously since the Soviet Union supposedly is "an economic basket case," its economy "on the verge of collapse." In January of this year, however, a study for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress conclusively refuted these claims.

The study revealed that from 1950 to 1980 the Soviet economy has experienced major growth as reflected in the following data:

- The gross national product has increased at an average annual rate of 4.6 percent, and has quadrupled over the last three decades.
- Industrial production has increased seven times.
- Farm output has doubled.
- Per capita consumption, while still below Western

levels, has tripled.

According to Senator William Proxmire, "the Soviet Union is perhaps the most self-reliant industrialized nation."

In 1960 the USA was first in the world in Gross Domestic Product per capita, but in 1980 it dropped to tenth place, behind nearly all West European countries.

Whatever amount of national attention our educational problem receives in public discussion in the next month or the next year, this attention by itself does not constitute more than the most superficial beginnings of an answer to the problem, the culmination of tendencies developing over at least half a century. To counter these tendencies, we must mount a sustained effort, a genuine national mobilization for education.

Some commentators have remarked on the failure of efforts to improve education in the period after Sputnik. Yet if one examines the facts, those efforts failed for one reason above all. The impulse and the effort were not sustained, because of the naive hope that a short-range or one-shot effort could solve deep-seated long-term problems. What a contrast to Soviet or Japanese programs sustained and developed decade after decade.

It takes 20 years to produce a qualified scientist or engineer, of which the first 10-12 years of training are crucial. If our public schools cannot attract and hold students to the sciences, a generation of future scientists will be lost forever. Yet, as the standard measures of academic performance show, our educational system is producing fewer and fewer able students in all fields.

These are challenges that our infatuation with sophisticated management techniques cannot help us

*(Continued on page 6)*

## LABORATORIES

*(Continued from page 4)*

tion; Fuqua arose to confirm that, though with no evident enthusiasm for the second violation of his Committee's jurisdiction.

However, Walker, a member of Fuqua's Committee, declared, "This is another \$5-million raid on the treasury. It was subjected to no hearings before the Committee. We had no information to work with before the bill came to the floor..."

The call for a vote produced a 215-115 majority for Columbia, whereupon Walker introduced a motion to recommit the bill to the Science and Technology Committee for "hearings on the impact on the Department of Energy basic research programs of establishing new research laboratories...at Columbia University and the Catholic University of America." That went down,

230-132.

Shortly afterwards, the Appropriations Subcommittee on which Mrs. Boggs sits endorsed funding for the newly authorized laboratories.

Research administrators at the Department of Energy privately concede that since this political row brought Catholic University to their attention, they have concluded that the Vitreous State Lab is doing fine work, of which they seem to have known little or nothing before. They have high regard for Turro at Columbia. And they note, too, that DoE programs have previously been the object of last-minute legislative thrusts.

It is not often, however, that the perpetrators are so blatant or that their clients are so candid. As one of the academics involved remarked to SGR, "It's not the usual way, but we decided that we'd take the political route. So what?"—DSG

## ...Can't Leave Reform to the States, He Warns

(Continued from page 5)

meet. Leaders of American industry must recognize, as their foreign competitors already do, that there is no substitute for technical experience and innovation. We must acknowledge that an educated population and a well-trained manpower force are essential to the recovery of our economic leadership and national defense.

This will require, above all, creativity, energy, and wisdom. Our goal should not be to imitate Soviet achievements, methods, or systems, but to conceive whatever new forms of American education are necessary to preserve our freedom.

Fortunately, the general public is showing increased awareness of the intricate relation between the state of our educational system and our economic position and national security. Representatives from every segment of society, from leaders of industry to concerned parents, are looking for national leadership and a program to solve the present educational crisis. Society needs guidance, purpose, and hope. It will then be ready to make serious commitments to an educational revival. To give up, to procrastinate, or to plan only for the short term would be to mortgage our freedom and our future.

The present crisis in US mathematics education has brought calls for new teacher training, new curricula and materials, and new "technological" instructional media. For reforms to have a lasting impact, however,

they must be based on a genuine understanding of the nature and development of the conceptual and cognitive processes involved in learning mathematics.

The Soviet Union has made tremendous efforts over the past 40 years to study the psychological aspects of mathematics learning. This has resulted in a large body of outstanding research and unexcelled levels of mathematics achievement for the general population. Focuses of Soviet research include principles of mathematical conceptualization, problem-solving, logical reasoning, programmed instruction, spatial perception, and methods of discerning and developing mathematical abilities...

Leaving educational progress to the individual states and localities has brought mixed results that the country as a whole can ill afford, especially in this time of recession. Along with resounding successes, like the North Carolina School for Mathematics and Science in Durham, there are thousands of stagnating schools in areas that simply lack the perspective and the resources to institute badly needed changes. National educational progress requires *national* leadership; it is just as vital to our future as a comprehensive and purposeful foreign policy and defense.

American education must not be allowed to sink to the level of a charity case. It is a crucial resource that must be developed. Even more than funding, it needs firm, practical leadership.

## In Print

From the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment:

*Technology, Innovation, and Regional Economic Development*, a survey of state and local government programs for promoting high-tech industrial development, including name, address, and outline of major activities throughout the country; (74 pages, \$4.50, GPO Stock Number 052-003-00912-90).

*Agricultural Postharvest Technology and Marketing Economics Research*, concludes that work in this area is neglected by the public and private sectors, with "real" expenditures down by 8 percent since 1978; suggests a big economic payoff could result from increased efforts; (118 pages, \$5, GPO Stock Number 052-003-00907-2).

Both available from Superintendent of Documents, USGPO, Washington, DC 20402.

*An Early Assessment of Three R&D Tax Incentives Provided by the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981*, by Eileen L. Collins, Division of Policy and Research Analysis, National Science Foundation, cautiously

reports preliminary indication of "improved tax treatment for growing R&D budgets," but warns that factors other than tax incentives might account for boosts in R&D spending; also that new cost-recovery features for R&D equipment seems unlikely "to have a direct impact" on equipment buying; copies free of charge from the Division of Policy Research and Analysis, NSF, 1800 G St. NW., Washington, DC 20550; tel. 202/357-7826.

*The National Science Board: Science Policy and Management for the National Science Foundation, 1968-1980*, a study prepared by the Library of Congress Science Policy Research Division, neutrally provides 737 pages of irrefutable evidence to support what sage outsiders have suspected all along—that the 24-member Board (officially the policy setter of the National Science Foundation) though furiously busy and generating whole archives per meeting, has rarely ever done anything of consequence; (copies free of charge—could it be otherwise?—from Science and Technology Committee, Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology, Suite 2321 Rayburn Building, Washington, DC 20515).

## A Long-Awaited Presidential Nod to Science

President Reagan's long-incoming first ceremonial gesture to the scientific community finally arrived last week with the presentation of the National Medal of Science to 12 researchers. But, to the annoyance of the White House Science office—which saw an opportunity for basking in presidential glory—the presentation was orchestrated by the White House Press Office, which apparently didn't regard the business as of much importance.

The ceremony, in the White House East Room, was brief, drew little press notice, and was accompanied by presidential remarks that are not likely to rank high in the annals of science and government. Noting that "our technological leadership is being challenged from abroad," the President said that "In the past, too many Americans tended to take our preeminence in science and engineering for granted." His administration's decimation of many R&D budgets was not mentioned.

The Medal of Science is considered to be the US

government's highest scientific award. It is given on no particular schedule. Nominations are by a presidentially appointed selection committee on which the President's Science Adviser is an ex-officio member.

Shunned in all past offerings was Edward Teller, long anathema to the highly influential arms-control segment of the scientific leadership. But that bunch lost power with the arrival of the Reagan Administration. This year, Teller was among the recipients, which must have been pleasing to his protege, Presidential Science Adviser George A. Keyworth.

The other recipients:

Philip W. Anderson of Princeton University and Bell Laboratories.  
Seymour Benzer of the California Institute of Technology  
Glenn W. Burton, U.S. Department of Agriculture at Tifton, Ga.  
Mildred Cohn, the University of Pennsylvania.  
F. Albert Cotton, Texas A&M University.  
Edward Heinemann, Heinemann Associates, Rancho Santa Fe, Calif.  
Donald L. Katz, the University of Michigan.  
Yoichiro Nambu, the University of Chicago.  
Gilbert Stork, Columbia University.  
Charles H. Townes, the University of California at Berkeley.  
Marshall Stone, the University of Massachusetts. Stone was unable to attend the ceremony.

### Science's Supreme Council?

*We can't vouch for the role or influence of the White House Science Council, which on paper, at least, is the government's senior science-advisory body. The Council meets only once every two months, a high risk for getting overlooked in Washington; its presumed working meetings are barred to the public, though an open play-acting session accompanies each session to satisfy the pesky Federal Advisory Committee Act. At the last meeting, May 20, only seven of the 12 members attended—another bad sign—and there are three vacancies, surely odd for a supreme council. In any case, for keeping SGR readers abreast of who's who in official science-policy circles, here's the current lineup:*

Solomon J. Buchsbaum (Chairman), Executive Vice President, Customer Systems, Bell labs  
Edward A. Frieman (Vice Chairman), Science Applications, Inc., La Jolla, Calif.

Harold M. Agnew, President, General Atomic Co.  
Allen Bromley, Professor of Physics, Yale  
George A. Cowan, Los Alamos National Laboratory  
Edward E. David Jr., President, Exxon Research and Engineering  
Donald S. Fredrickson, Vice President, Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Bethesda, Md.

Paul E. Gray, President, MIT  
Robert O. Hunter, President, Western Research Corp., San Diego  
Arthur K. Kerman, Professor of Physics, MIT  
David Packard, Board Chairman, Hewlett-Packard  
Edward Teller, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory

The Executive Director is Jerry D. Jennings. Address: White House Science Council, Office of Science and Technology Policy, Room 5013, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20506.

### Correction

Dartmouth College's indirect-cost rate was incorrectly stated in SGR Vol. XIII, No. 7. The correct figure is 48.5 percent.

## Subscription Form

**Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station  
Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015**

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed

☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$132.50 ☐; two years, \$235.00 ☐

(Overseas airmail, \$25.00 per year additional.)

Name

Address

Zip

## DoD Advised to Add New Secrecy Classification

Restoration of the "restricted" category to the present three levels of government secrecy has been recommended to the Pentagon in a study on "Control of Unclassified Technology with Military Application."

But if that isn't done, says the study, Defense should push for eliminating provisions of the Freedom of Information Act which provide for public access to virtually all unclassified material. The study was produced by Advanced Technology Systems, Inc., of Vienna, Va., for the Defense Department's Director for Counterintelligence and Security Policy. DoD's hardliners are said to like the recommendations for additional curbs on information, but, according to the *Washington Post*, the Office of Management and Budget regards the proposals as unnecessary.

The study, unpublished but circulating around Washington, complains that "little has been accomplished in the way of a positive reaction" to an unclassified report, "Soviet Acquisition of Western Technology," that the CIA issued last year.

Listing the technologies that the Soviets are said to be pursuing—it's claimed there's little they're not

after—the study says that the existing categories of top secret, secret, and confidential are insufficient because "There is a substantial amount of information...concerning these technologies which, though unclassified, will assist our adversaries to an immeasurable degree to acquire the total technology if these elements of information continue to be uncontrolled."

To provide guidance for classifying unclassified material, the study says that for each technology, "a philosophical statement should be developed describing in sufficient detail the importance of unclassified elements of information related to that technology. In this statement, the questions must be answered, what unclassified information is related to this technology that is militarily significant, is not possessed by or available to potential adversaries and, if acquired by them would permit a substantial advance in their military capabilities..."

The study adds that "Knowledgeable people have estimated that, within a 90-day time frame, guidance statements could be developed for the approximately 20 technologies identified as Soviet high-priority targets."

---

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station  
Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

---

Second class postage paid  
at Washington, D.C.

---

Xerox-University Microfilms  
300 N. Zeeb Rd  
Ann Arbor

MI 48106

9999



